

**SPEECH**

**OF**

**HON. THADDEUS STEVENS, OF PENN.,**

**ON**

**THE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTION, AND THE SLAVERY ISSUE.**

**DELIVERED**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 12, 1852.**

---

**WASHINGTON:**  
**PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.**  
**1852.**

## THE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTION.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the Army Appropriation Bill—

Mr. STEVENS, of Pennsylvania, said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Certain recent events, unimportant in themselves but of deep significance, induce me to trouble you for a short time. A small fragment of the Whig party have deserted their colors, and gone over—with what little political material they could collect—to the camp of the enemy. [Laughter.] This in itself is a very small and insignificant occurrence, but it is an index and plain interpretation of many past exciting events, which have acquired a painful notoriety in the history of our country. It is a further development of a plan deliberately formed years ago, to organize parties upon different principles, if not under different names, from what had heretofore existed. It is a strong link in the chain of overwhelming evidence, which conclusively proves that the excitement which was created in this Hall three years since, and which so frightened ancient dames and old maidish men—that the wildfire which was kindled here, and sent forth to scorch the nation, was all created and all kindled for this contemptible conclusion. Until lately, the principles of the Whig party were clearly defined, and well understood. They consisted in obedience to the Constitution and all constitutional laws; in a protective tariff; in an equal participation of the public lands; in river and harbor improvements; in a sound currency, and a well-regulated commerce. In all other things Whigs were permitted to differ in opinion, without forfeiting their allegiance to their party. They did differ in many things—on the question, for instance, of the naturalization laws, the cause of education, of morals, and religion. Being a national party, they were necessarily permitted to differ upon the subject of African slavery. In the South, Whigs and Democrats were slaveholders; but even there, many were found who condemned the institution, deplored its existence, and hoped for its final overthrow. But this question was not incorporated into any party creed. Emancipationists were found in both political parties. In the North, a great majority of the people believed, as they still believe, that slavery was a great moral, religious, and political evil—a disgrace to the nation, a reproach to humanity. They acknowledged their

obligations to tolerate its existence, and to execute the provisions of the Constitution with regard to it. But in the North, opinion was by no means uniform. Scattered throughout all the free States, many men were found whose dispositions naturally inclined to domination, who sincerely believed that a portion of the human race were created for no other purpose than to be servants of others; that a part of mortal clay was of finer texture and nobler mould than the rest. This class was especially numerous in our large commercial cities, where more men are mercenary, and where princely fortunes beget kingly appetites.

But this was never made a party question, nor attempted to be introduced into a party creed. Had it been, parties long ago, instead of being known as Whigs and Democrats, would have rallied under the names of slavery or freedom. To avoid this issue which must soon have degenerated into a mere sectional contest, has been the honest, sincere, and constant aim of all that portion of the Whig party that favored freedom. Whether they will be successful or not, I think, depends much on the result of the ensuing election. Slavery, being local, was not suffered to disturb national parties, for, indeed, it was impossible to incorporate into a uniform creed for any party, what three fourths of the people abhorred and one fourth loved. To tolerate each other in their opinions upon this subject, and leave it an open question, was all that could reasonably be expected on either side of the line. But, as slaves became more numerous, and the produce of their labor became important articles of trade, the advocates of that institution determined to extend its boundaries, and change the whole current of public thought and public action with regard to it. They began some years ago, by denouncing and ridiculing the GREAT TRUTH first promulgated by the inspired authors of American independence, "that all men are born free and equal, and entitled to the inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To reduce this opinion to practical operation in both sections, the ambition of statesmen and the avarice of merchants have been appealed to. It was believed that if the whole South could be combined together, with a modicum of northern parasites, it would be sufficient to bend the proudest ambition and the sternest will. It has been successfully tried on more than one northern aspirant to the

Presidency of each party, whose carcasses now strew the political field; and it is now being tried upon that self-poised patriot who never yet quailed before the dictation of mortal man.

Sir, I have been led into these remarks by the gentleman near me, [Mr. FAULKNER,] and the gentlemen from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] who is not now in his seat; and I say that, in my judgment, it was to aid this object, that, three years ago, at the opening of Congress, the gentleman from Georgia and his associates raised a furor and clamor within this Hall which could hardly have been justified had the Republic been in flames. Sir, their assigned cause for it was all factitious and unreal. I speak but the sentiment of the late lamented Executive, when I say that never for one moment was this Union in danger. Outside the walls of Congress, there was no excitement among the people except what was created here, and sent forth from this focus. The people nowhere desired the dissolution of the Union, except perhaps, in a single long-cherished instance, and there it was desired not for safety, not for security, but for separate empire, for independent chiefs.

The object of all this disgraceful turmoil, of all this false clamor, of all this national disturbance, was to compel both the political parties to incorporate into their party creeds the defense and propagation of slavery.

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] stated with great candor, and the respectable gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. FAULKNER,] in his late speech, gave as the specific reason for his abandonment of his party, that this subject of slavery was paramount to all others; every other question is to bow down before it; manufactures, agriculture, commerce, and especially liberty, are to be rejected, and slavery is to become the idol of our political adoration.

The gentleman from Georgia denounced conventions. I agree with most that he said with regard to the construction of conventions, and the authority of their acts. I admit that the decrees of political conventions, and especially their dogmas, are of very low authority. Those conventions are often framed in a discreditable manner. The Democratic party lately found the State of South Carolina represented by a single self-elected delegate—General Commander.

Mr. ORR. No, sir, he was not admitted.

Mr. STEVENS. Not at the late convention, but at the one before that he cast the whole vote of South Carolina. At the late convention he was there, but could not command them. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, I will deal impartially, and speak of the Whig Convention lately held at Baltimore. It admitted delegates from States having no Whig organization. The State of Georgia, as any gentleman from that State will bear me witness, had disbanded the Whig party, and never would have thought of sending delegates to that Convention had they not been stimulated by an express from Washington. The constituents of the delegates who cast the vote of that State were members of Congress whom I daily see around me, and heads of Departments, and not the people of Georgia. Why, sir, that same messenger extended his journey to Charleston to search for Whigs enough there to represent South Carolina. It is said that when he got there, and they were all mustered,

they amounted to *three*, and that the rest of that delegation was composed of custom-house officers from the city of New York. [Laughter.] I admit that the platforms framed by such conventions can have no binding authority upon the people, especially as the people never delegated to them the power to construct platforms. They were sent there to select candidates to represent well-known principles, and not to teach principles either to the people or to the candidates. They were sent there to fix upon candidates to represent principles which were established before they were born—which were promulgated by Washington and Hamilton, by Jefferson and Madison, and other great men of the past and present age. For conventions of General Commanders and hired tide-waiters, to construct platforms for the people, is simply absurd arrogance.

But, sir, let that pass. It does not trouble me. Nobody is bound to protect these crude novelties, these misshapen monsters, but those who begot and brought them forth.

Sir, I agree, also, with most of what the gentleman from Georgia so well said with regard to the growing and absorbing influence of the Executive, and the unworthy purposes to which it is too often applied. We have all seen and felt it under every Administration. Many of those around me have seen it force measures through this House, against the known and declared opinions of a large majority of its members. It has worked miracles in more ways than I choose to stop to enumerate. We have seen it convert the sturdiest defenders of freedom into a mob of sycophants.

But, sir, the chief object of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] with the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. FAULKNER,] seemed to be to examine the platforms and nominees of the parties, and to ascertain which was most favorable to slavery, in order that he and his "Union" associates might range themselves under that banner. He took up the Whig platform, some things in which he does not like, although on the subject of slavery it is sufficiently explicit, provided General Scott had declared that it met his cordial approval and would receive his hearty support, which the gentleman says that General Scott has not said, and he says it truly. Now, sir, in most that the gentleman says with regard to these resolutions as a whole, and in disliking them, I agree with him, although not, perhaps, for the same reasons. I have read those resolutions carefully, and I do not think they contain very good Whig doctrine. They are very faint upon the subject of internal improvements, and they entirely fritter away, and reduce to the standard of Locofoco folly the question of a protective tariff, [laughter,] and reduce it to a mere incidental or accidental protection, depending entirely upon the accident of the amount of revenue required, and the amount receivable—a doctrine which my learned colleague [Mr. Ross] might well indorse, and I hope he will get upon this platform. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, they have, very unwisely, as I think, interpolated a resolution with regard to non-interference, about which Whigs differ, and will continue to differ. It is a foolish thing to attempt to make uniform what all human minds can never reduce to practical uniformity. Their compromise resolutions are creatures of modern birth, not the legitimate children of Whiggery, for which the

whole Whig family is responsible. But, as I said before, I shall let that pass. I leave them for those who produced them to nourish. I shall not disturb their parental fondling, but they will never find me to nurse them.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toomas] then takes up the Democratic platform, and finds that it is opposed to his long-cherished principles. He finds it is opposed to a protective tariff; to river and harbor improvements, and an equal participation in the public domain; in short, to all the ancient Whig doctrines. But he finds that it is ultra upon the subject of the protection of slavery, and the perpetuation of the fugitive slave law and the gagging of the people; and he and his associates, at once, gracefully mount the Democratic slavery platform. But the gentleman makes a greater distinction between the nominees than the platforms, and, for his purpose, greatly prefers General Pierce to General Scott. He says, speaking of General Scott and slavery—and also, the same thing is repeated in this proclamation to the nation, signed by nine or ten gentlemen, with a kind of half postscript or half indorsement by two other gentlemen, [see note at end of speech]—“I have already shown that General Scott’s friends are not to be trusted with these principles.” While General Pierce says: “I accept the nomination upon the platform adopted by the Convention, not because it is expected of me as a candidate, but because the principles it embraces command the approbation of my judgment, and with them I believe I can safely say, *there has been no word or act of my life in conflict.*” From their letters and their antecedents the gentleman concludes, as well as the gentleman in front of me, [Mr. FAULKNER]—and in that they agree remarkably with the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. ORR]—that slavery would be much safer in the hands of General Pierce than in the hands of General Scott.

Now, sir, I intend to be frank upon this subject. So far as enforcing the provisions of the Constitution, with regard to slavery, is concerned, in all its parts, I believe no man in this Union could be more faithful than General Scott. His whole life has been spent in administering and submitting to discipline; and having taken the official oath of Chief Magistrate to support the Constitution of the United States, it seems to me that none but base-minded men would distrust its fulfillment; but if gentlemen require, as they plainly do require, that any act of Congress, amending or repealing the fugitive slave law, should be met by Executive obstructions, and arrested by the Executive veto; and that the whole influence of his Administration should be used for that purpose, I am free to say, that I do not believe they can rely upon General Scott for such high-handed tyranny. If they require that the Executive shall afford facilities for extending slavery into territory now free, or the admission of new slave States into the Union, beyond the line of compact now existing, I think I hazard nothing in saying that they cannot rely upon General Scott. Upon the other hand, I am constrained to admit, that in all official as well as extra-official efforts by the use of the Executive veto, to prevent the amendment or repeal of the fugitive slave law, and to afford facilities for the spread of slavery into free lands, and for the admission of new slave States into the

Union, they can rely most implicitly upon General Pierce, notwithstanding what some foolish men have published about some speech made by him at New Boston. [Laughter.] If he ever did utter such sentiments—if he ever did fall into the path of rectitude, it was momentary and accidental, and for which he is not to be held responsible, [renewed laughter]—for all his votes in Congress, and all his public acts everywhere, proclaim him the champion of Slavery. If this election is to be put on the sole grounds of supporting slavery beyond the requirements of the Constitution, (as is now apparent,) and all other questions are to be considered of minor importance, then those gentlemen who think so are right in abandoning all other parties and supporting Pierce. I concede further, that if my friend from New York, [Mr. P. KING,] and those who profess to be anti-slavery men elsewhere—if the whole Democratic party do rally in support of General Pierce at the coming election, it will conclusively prove the truth of what was long ago asserted by one of their ablest statesmen, that northern Democracy is the natural ally of southern slavery. If this is the position of gentlemen, they are right in opposing General Scott, and going for General Pierce. I find no fault with those who make that the sole object of this contest.

But the gentleman from Georgia, in this proclamation, says—I speak of the gentleman from Georgia only—a part for the whole—and when you take a small part you have got nearly all, [laughter.]—General Scott has not been sufficiently explicit in his acceptance of the platform. In making these remarks he puts out of view General Scott’s telegraphic acceptance, because, he says, that when he sent that dispatch, he had before him an edition of the platform very different from that published under official sanction. That is all true. The first resolutions published, which General Scott had before him, had not the words “final with regard to the compromise,” in them; but they are there as certified by the officers of the Convention. I admit, therefore, that General Scott is not to be judged by the platform, but by his letter of acceptance, and his previously-declared, published, and known opinions. Now, in that letter General Scott declares that he will see the laws executed, and will abide by all the principles of the Whig party. But that is not sufficient. He is required to declare that certain laws now in existence shall be *final and irrevocable*, and that he will insure their permanency by the use of the Executive veto, and that he will use the whole power and patronage of his high office to prevent discussion on the subject of slavery. Now, sir, this doctrine, which General Scott repudiates, and which General Pierce adopts, is unmitigated tyranny. What authority is there in this Government to make any law *final or irrevocable*? Who has the power to make an act of the National Legislature not only equal to, but superior to the Constitution? Any attempt to enforce such a doctrine is arbitrary and despotic. The efforts which have been lately made by members of Congress, and high officers of the Government, to paralyze the free action of Congress, and to overawe and intimidate public opinion, is unconstitutional, and destructive of every element of freedom. This movement of these gentlemen is but another march in the same direction. When-

ever any Executive or any statesman shall command the people not to think, or not to utter their thoughts, and it does not cost him his political life, I shall tremble for the liberties of the nation. Whenever a political party attempts it, it deserves to die. Whoever—whether individual, or Government, or party—attempts to enforce such principles, is as detestable a tyrant as the King of Dahomy, the gates of whose city, and the portals of whose palace are garnished with the hideous heads and eyeless skulls of slaughtered slaves! Sir, this atrocious attempt must fail in this country. You may imprison the wind, you may chain the forked lightning, but you cannot bind the free thought and free utterance of a nation of freemen!

The gentleman, and those who act with him, say "the only pledges and guarantees he (General Scott) offers for his adherence to the principles of these resolutions, are the known incidents 'of a long life,' &c., and 'that among these known incidents there is no one, so far as we are aware, in favor of the compromise.'" "In one of his published letters he has expressed sentiments hostile 'to the institutions of fifteen States of this Union.'" Now, the letter to which the gentleman refers is the letter of General Scott, dated February, 1843, and written to J. P. Atkinson, Esq., on the subject of slavery, in which he says substantially that he "early became deeply impressed with the views given by Mr. Jefferson in his notes on Virginia, and by Judge Tucker, in his appendix to Blackstone's Commentaries in favor of the gradual abolition of slavery."

He adds in the same letter, "I need hardly say that Congress has no color of authority for touching the relation of master and slave in the States." But he adds, "I am persuaded it is a high obligation of masters and slaveholding States to employ all means not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to meliorate slavery even to extermination."

Now, sir, I care not what pretenses are set up, in my judgment, that letter is the head and front of General Scott's offending. He holds the doctrine of Jefferson and Tucker. He believes in the Declaration of Independence; and while he accords to slavery the whole protection which the Constitution gives it, he believes it to be a moral duty in slaveholding States voluntarily to abolish slavery. And for this he is opposed by the bigots of slavery. I thank God that they have such cause of opposition.

The gentleman says he does not find enough in the acts and pledges referred to by General Scott to induce him to trust him. Now, sir, I think that very few of his fellow-citizens will agree with him in regard to this. I am not now going to recount the acts, both civil and military, which entitle General Scott to the nation's confidence. He is qualified by nature and education to guide both civil and military affairs. A lawyer by profession, he is known to be deeply versed in both municipal and international law. He is, perhaps, the greatest master of his own art—the art of war—of any man now living. Brave as Julius Cæsar, with no particle of his ambition. Like him, he has written ably upon subjects connected with his own profession.

But, sir, I shall not stop, as I said before, to recount many of his acts. I might refer, but I will not at length, to his acts of youthful valor

in the war of 1812, at Fort Erie, at Chippewa, at Niagara; or to his more recent glorious campaign in Mexico. Vera Cruz, Cerro Gordo, Churubusco, and Chapultepec, are all eternal monuments of his enduring fame. They, and his acts there, have passed into history, and become immortal. And, sir, the future historian will be compelled by impartial truth to illustrate the brightest pages of forty years of the annals of America with the glorious deeds of valor and of patriotism of Winfield Scott.

And yet he is not to be trusted because he is not in favor of the perpetual bondage of the human race! Let the people of America know and decide this eventful issue, for the issue is made and it must come.

I believe, notwithstanding what these gentlemen have said, that there are incidents in the life of General Scott which show more disinterested patriotism and devotion to his country than can be found in the life of any other man living or dead, except the "Father of his Country."

It may not be indelicate for me to mention one fact, which perhaps all have heard, although somewhat erroneously reported by fame: After General Scott had been for months the civil and military ruler of Mexico, his administration became so highly appreciated that many of their ablest men, having the ability to do what they offered, proposed to General Scott that when peace should be concluded, for a treaty was then being negotiated, and he should have disbanded such of his forces in Mexico as were entitled to a discharge at the conclusion of peace, which were about twelve thousand men, he should reëntail them for the Mexican service at double their previous pay, and should resign his own commission in the Army of the United States, and be proclaimed President of the Republic by the Congress then sitting; and as an indemnity for the future for that act, five of their wealthiest citizens, fully competent to perform, offered to deposit instantly in the city of New York, or wherever he should direct, one million of dollars to his credit, and insure him that the Government would grant him \$250,000 a year salary. It would have been perfectly lawful, perhaps honorable in him, after having dissolved his connection with his native country, and disbanded his army at the conclusion of peace, to have accepted the proposition. He rejected it, and returned poor and persecuted to his native land, to be told by some of his fellow-citizens that he is not to be trusted; that he has not given sufficient pledges of his devotion to his country! Pledges, sir, of General Scott! You need not look simply for them on paper or figured parchment. They are deeply graven in his flesh and bones by the steel and the lead of the enemies of his country.

And yet, windy politicians, who have never shown their devotion to their native land except by "long orations" and the possession of office, dare sit in judgment upon the fidelity of this mutilated hero!

Mr. Chairman, let me ask those who, like my friend before me, [Mr. NEWTON,] my colleague from Pennsylvania, [Mr. JOHN W. HOWE,] or if I dare approach those holding similar sentiments upon the other side of the House, let me ask all, everywhere, who desire to restrain slavery within constitutional limits, how they can honestly refuse

their support to General Scott? You see and know that the issue of extra constitutional slavery is staked on the success of General Pierce. The gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. FAULKNER,] following the views of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] and others, opposes General Scott, because a vote for him will not imply an approval of the slavery policy. He asks:

"Will a vote for General Scott imply an approval of that policy? Will he so wield his Executive influence if elected, and so dispense the patronage of the Government, as to give strength and power to the friends of that policy against its enemies? So far from it, that he distinctly announces that he will not (*a la mode Fillmore*) attempt, by proscription, to reduce his supporters to exact conformity of opinion upon this or any other question. Will he, if the enemies of the South and of the Constitution should accomplish a repeal of that law, interpose his veto, and save the country from the terrible consequence of such an act? We are told by those upon this floor who profess to know and speak his sentiments, that he would not, in such a case, interpose his veto; that such an exercise of the veto power would not be in accordance with Whig principles."

Will not General Pierce's success discourage the friends of constitutional liberty? With the whole sympathies, and influence, and patronage of the General Government against them, will not their hands become weak and their hearts faint? They see the issue distinctly made, and I ask them now if, upon such an issue, they suffer General Pierce to be elected, to dispense his patronage as his friends require of him, to exercise the veto power—I ask them if they can, consistently with their principles, not merely not vote for General Pierce, but refuse their support to his opponent?

It is not for me to admonish others. Every man must act and think for himself; but would it not be well for those professing anti-slavery principles to look well to their consistency and their consciences before they peril both by aiding by acts of commission or omission this illegitimate, slave-propagating democracy?

A single word to slaveholders, and I am done. Does not your safety—I think it does—depend upon the continued union of these States, and the harmonious action of all sections? Do you believe that that union and that harmony will be promoted by the election of General Pierce? You have distinctly made the issue against General Scott, because he does not love slavery, although you know he will afford it all the protection which the Constitution requires. In short, you have forced a sectional issue on the country; if for these reasons General Scott should be defeated, do you believe that hereafter you can ever avoid the sectional issue in any coming national election? Do you believe that the North, tame as she is, when so often trod upon, will never turn? And if the issue shall be made the result cannot be doubtful.

I know your answer will be that then you will vindicate yourselves by a separate confederacy. I see and feel that this is the tendency of your present movement; but are you quite sure that with your increasing slaves and increased burdens, you can protect yourselves against foreign foes and servile dangers?

You could find no nation who would enter into a treaty with you for the extradition of your fugitives from labor. You would be in constant collision with surrounding nations, and war would ensue. Your chivalry would not permit you to yield upon that point. And with impending or ex-

isting wars, might not some Spartacus of African blood arise, and call his brethren to arms to shake off oppression. With the sympathies of the civilized world in their favor, might they not find allies who would compel you to grant them a just emancipation? These dangers are not to be treated lightly. St. Domingo found energetic leaders who were able to inflict terrible retribution upon their former masters. The ancient gladiator, with an army of rebel slaves, ravaged the very heart of Italy, and for three years held one of her richest and finest provinces against the whole power of imperial Rome. I know you would scorn the idea of treating with such an enemy, but if it be true, as your greatest statesman has declared, that in such a conflict every attribute of the God of armies would be upon their side, might not they bury their chains beneath the ruins of your empire?

These are painful reflections, but no candid and intelligent statesman can calmly contemplate passing events, and exclude from his saddened mind these fearful forebodings. May the sound sense and true patriotism of the American people arrest the headlong career of reckless men.

## APPENDIX.

WASHINGTON, July 3, 1852.

To prevent all mistake and misapprehension, we, the undersigned, members of Congress, adopt this method of making a joint statement to our constituents, respectively, and to all who may take an interest in the subject, that we cannot and will not support General Scott for the Presidency, as he now stands before the American people, for the following, amongst other reasons:

He obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of that series of measures of the last Congress known as the compromise, the permanent maintenance of which with us is a question of paramount importance. Nor has he since his nomination made any declaration of his approval of those measures as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy.

It is true, the resolutions of the Convention that nominated him are as clear and as explicit upon this question as need be; but General Scott, in his letter of acceptance, which contains all that we have from him on that matter, does not give them the approval of his judgment. This he seems studiously to have avoided. He accepts the nomination "with the resolutions annexed." That is, he takes the nomination *cum onere*, as an individual takes an estate, with whatever incumbrances it may be loaded with. And the only pledge and guarantee he offers for his "adherence to the principles of the resolutions" are "the known incidents of a long public life," &c.

Amongst these "known incidents" of his life there is not one, so far as we are aware of, in favor of the principles of the compromise. In one, at least, of his public letters he has expressed sentiments inimical to the institutions of fifteen States of the Union. Since the passage of the compromise he has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open and avowed enemies of those measures. And in the Convention that conferred this nomination upon him he permitted himself to be used by the *Free-Soilers* in that body to defeat Mr. FILLMORE and Mr. WEBSTER, because of their advocacy of these measures, and their firm adherence to the policy that sustained them.

To join such men, and aid them in completing their triumph over, and sacrifice of the true and tried friends of the Constitution, and the faithful discharge of all its obligations, is what we can never do. The dictates of duty and patriotism sternly forbid it.

We consider General Scott as the favorite candidate of the *Free-Soil* wing of the Whig party. That his policy, if he should be elected, would be warped and shaped to conform to their views, and to elevate them to power in the administration of the Government, can but be considered as a legitimate and probable result. And, believing as we do, that the views of that faction of mischievous men are dangerous not only to the just and constitutional rights of the southern States, (which we represent in part,) but to the peace and quiet of the whole country, and to the permanent union of the States, we regard it as the highest duty of the well-wishers of the country every where, whatever else they

may do, to at least withhold from him their support. This we intend to do.

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, of Ga.  
CHARLES JAS. FAULKNER, of Va.  
W. BROOKE, of Miss.  
ALEX. WHITE, of Ala.  
JAMES ABERCROMBIE, of Ala.  
R. TOOMBS, of Ga.  
JAMES JOHNSON, of Ga.

For reasons to some extent indicated in speeches and addresses heretofore made by the undersigned, they deem it to be their duty to withhold their support from General Scott as a candidate for the Presidency. If it should seem to be necessary, we will hereafter, in some form, exhibit more fully to our constituents the facts and reasons which have brought us to this determination.

M. P. GENTRY, Tenn.  
C. H. WILLIAMS, Tenn.